

Stern et al.

S/N: 10/063,998

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed July 15, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 16, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (USP 6,594,673). The Examiner next rejected claims 2, 3, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Jacoby et al. (US 2001/0034639). Claims 4, 6, 7, 12, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Jacoby et al., and further in view of Hoffer (USP 5,799,151). Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Hoffer, and further in view of Leeds (US 2002/0138588). Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Hoffer, and further in view of Leeds and further in view of Durst Jr. et al. (US 20010032252). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 21. Claim 21 has been amended to correct its dependency and correct a typographical error.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. Claim 1 calls for, in part, placing a copy of a post on each of the one or more other computerized bulletin boards related to the at least one topic of relevance of the post. Claim 10 calls for, in part, a computer readable storage medium having a computer program for content tagging posts to computerized bulletin boards and representing a set of instructions that when executed by a computer causes the computer to place a copy of the user post on each of the one or more specific computerized bulletin boards dedicated to the one or more specific topics of relevance of the user post. Claim 22 calls for, in part, a computer having means to automatically place a copy of a user post on each content-specific bulletin board to which the post relates and on the content-general bulletin board. Smith et al. does not teach that called for in claims 1, 10, and 22. Smith et al. does not teach placing a copy of a post on another bulletin board related to the topic of interest of the post.

Smith et al. "relates to visualizations for interactive collaborative information and, in particular, to systems and methods for visualizing relationships in information relating to computer network interaction media." Col. 1, lns. 10-13. Smith et al. states that "[t]he present invention provides improved visualizations of relationships or connections in collaborative information relating to network interaction media...." Col. 2, lns. 10-13. Figure 4 of Smith et al. illustrates an inter-group visualization format 100 with links 104 representing posts cross-posted between newsgroups 102 and core newsgroups 106. Figure 4, Col. 6, lns. 4-10. Figure 4 also

Stern et al.

S/N: 10/063,998

shows links 108 representing posts cross-posted between newsgroups 102 and other newsgroups 102. Figure 4, Col. 6, Ins. 11-17. However, Smith et al. does not teach copying or cross-posting the posts to more than one newsgroup, thus forming a link between newsgroups that can be displayed. It merely identifies newsgroups linked to one another through cross-posted posts. Smith et al. does not teach placing a copy of a post found in one newsgroup in another newsgroup.

Smith et al. states that the inter-group visualization format 100 "may be used as an indicator of the commonality in the subject matter of different newsgroups." Col. 6, Ins. 27-30. Also, "large numbers of cross-posts between groups may indicate similarities in the subject matter or topics covered by the two groups." Col. 6, Ins. 25-27. However, as stated above, Smith et al. does not teach placing a copy of a post in other related group or groups. In the context of the present invention, it appears that Smith et al. could be used with the present invention, but only after conducting the steps/acts called for in claims 1, 10, or 22 because Smith et al. does not place copies of posts in other newsgroups, but rather merely displays a visualization format indicating newsgroups linked to one another through cross-posted posts. The present invention overcomes that problem of having to cross-post posts. As called for, each independent claim includes steps/acts that include a first post and detecting a topic of relevance of that post and then placing a copy of that post on other boards. For the same reason the Examiner found claim 21 allowable, each individual claim is believed allowable.

Therefore, since Smith et al. fails to teach that which is called for in claims 1, 10, and 22 and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes claims 1, 10, 22, and those claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Hoffer, and further in view of Leeds. The Examiner stated that "Smith discloses ... automatically placing a copy of the post on another computerized bulletin board related to the another topic of interest...." Office Action, p. 8. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As stated above, Smith et al. merely identifies newsgroups linked to one another through cross-posted posts. Incorporating the arguments set forth above, Smith et al. does not teach or suggest a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a set of instructions which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to integrate a post with one or more computerized bulletin boards by automatically placing a copy of the post on another computerized bulletin board related to the another topic of interest as called for in claim 17.

Stern et al.

S/N: 10/063,998

Furthermore, neither Hoffer nor Leeds, individually or combined separately or together with Smith et al., teach or suggest automatically placing a copy of the post on another computerized bulletin board related to the another topic of interest as called for in claim 17. Therefore, since the art of record fails to teach that which is called for in claim 17, and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes claim 17, and those claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-22.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent L. Baker
Registration No. 52,584
Telephone 262-376-5170
klh@zpspatents.com

Dated: October 5, 2004
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.124

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, LLC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170